


REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application with claims 1-2 and 5-6 rejected. Reexamination and reconsideration are hereby requested.

Claim 1 was rejected as anticipated by Smith. The Examiner cited column 24, lines 18-20 and column 31, lines 5-10 for the claim 1 requirement of "continuously flowing .. catalyst ...".

Applicants reply first that Smith column 24, lines 18-20 states "Alternatively, one may catalyze the precursor with 0.5M ammonium nitrate before filling the mold." This means 0.5 M ammonium nitrate is used instead of the 1M HNO₃ of column 23, line 56 and there is no suggestion of any flowing catalyst. In contrast, the solution, including catalyst, is put into a mold; see column 23, line 62 and column 24, line 19. Further, column 31, lines 5-10 do not suggest flowing a vapor catalyst. Rather, Smith uses closed chambers (see Figs.16A-19C) and likely would add a vapor catalyst as noted in column 31, lines 5-10 by using a chamber as illustrated in Fig.19C and described in column 27, lines 53-64. This is not the flowing of a catalyst over the precursor layer as required by claim 1, but rather Smith is just adding a vapor catalyst to a closed chamber. Consequently, sole independent claim 1 is patentable over the references.

Respectfully submitted,



Carlton H. Hoel
Reg. No. 29,934
Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
972.917.4365